arXiv:math/0503441v2 [math.NT] 24 Mar 2005

A note on Primes in Short Intervals

Tsz Ho Chan

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Instead of a strong quantitative form of the Hardy-Littlewood prime k-tuple conjecture, one can assume an average form of it and still obtains the same distribution result on $\psi(x+h) - \psi(x)$ by Montgomery and Soundararajan [1].

1 Introduction

Let $\Lambda(n)$ be von Mangoldt lambda function, $\mu(n)$ be the Möbius function and $\phi(n)$ be the Euler's phi function. Let $e(\theta) = e^{2\pi i\theta}$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $\psi(x) = \sum_{n \le x} \Lambda(n)$. In [1], Montgomery and Soundararajan studied the distribution of primes in short intervals

$$M_K(N; H) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\psi(n+H) - \psi(n) - H)^K \tag{1}$$

under a strong quantitative form of the Hardy-Littlewood prime k-tuple conjecture:

Conjecture 1.

$$\sum_{n \le x} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \Lambda(n + d_i) = \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{D})x + E_k(x; \mathcal{D}) \tag{2}$$

holds with

$$E_k(x; \mathcal{D}) \ll_{\epsilon, K} N^{1/2+\epsilon}$$

uniformly for $1 \le k \le K$, $0 \le x \le N$, *and distinct* d_i *satisfying* $1 \le d_i \le H$. *Here* $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, d_2, ..., d_k\}$, *and*

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{\substack{q_1,\ldots,q_k \\ 1 \le q_i < \infty}} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\mu(q_i)}{\phi(q_i)} \Big) \sum_{\substack{a_1,\ldots,a_k \\ 1 \le a_i \le q_i \\ (a_i,q_i)=1 \\ \sum a_i/q_i \in \mathbb{Z}}} e\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{a_i d_i}{q_i} \Big)$$

is the singular series as in equation (2) of [1].

They proved

Theorem 1. *Under Conjecture 1,*

$$\begin{aligned} M_K(N;H) =& \mu_k H^{K/2}\int_1^N (\log x/H + B)^{K/2} dx \\ &+ O\Big(N(\log N)^{K/2} H^{K/2}\Big(\frac{H}{\log N}\Big)^{-1/(8K)} + H^K N^{1/2+\epsilon}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $\log N \le H \le N^{1/K}$*, where* $\mu_k = 1\cdot 3\cdots(k-1)$ *if* k *is even, and* $\mu_k = 0$ *if* k *is odd;* $B = 1 - C_0 - \log 2\pi$ *and* C_0 *denotes Euler's constant.*

The first author of [1] suggested to the present author that Theorem 1 is probably true under an average form of the Hardy-Littlewood prime k-tuple conjecture, namely:

Conjecture 2. *For* $x \ge H$*,*

$$\sum_{\substack{d_1,\ldots,d_k \\ 1\le d_i\le H \\ d_i \text{ distinct}}} E_k(x,\mathcal{D})^2 \ll_k x^{1+\epsilon} H^k.$$

Our goal in this paper is to prove Theorem 1 under Conjecture 2.

Acknowledgement The author would like to thank Prof. Hugh Montgomery for suggesting the problem and the American Institute of Mathematics for provision both financially and spatially.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Lemma 1. *With* $\Lambda_0(n) = \Lambda(n) - 1$ *and* $|A|$ *denoting the size of a set* A*,*

$$\sum_{n\le x}\prod_{i=1}^k \Lambda_0(n+d_i) = \mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D})x + O(\sum_{\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,2,\ldots,k\}} |E_{|\mathcal{J}|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})|)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D}) = \sum_{\substack{q_1,\ldots,q_k \\ 1<q_i<\infty}} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{\mu(q_i)}{\phi(q_i)}\Big) \sum_{\substack{a_1,\ldots,a_k \\ 1\le a_i\le q_i \\ (a_i,q_i)=1 \\ \sum a_i/q_i\in\mathbb{Z}}} e\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i d_i}{q_i}\Big)$$

and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}} = \{d_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$.

Proof: The left hand side

$$\begin{aligned}
&=\sum_{n\le x}\prod_{i=1}^{k}(\Lambda(n+d_i)-1)=\sum_{n\le x}\sum_{\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,2,\ldots,k\}}(-1)^{k-|\mathcal{J}|}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\Lambda(n+d_i)\\
&=\sum_{\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,2,\ldots,k\}}(-1)^{k-|\mathcal{J}|}\sum_{n\le x}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\Lambda(n+d_i)\\
&=\sum_{\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,2,\ldots,k\}}(-1)^{k-|\mathcal{J}|}(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})x+E_{|\mathcal{J}|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}}))\\
&=\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D})x+O(\sum_{\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,2,\ldots,k\}}|E_{|\mathcal{J}|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})|)
\end{aligned}$$

by (2) and the identity $\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D})=\sum_{\mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{D}}(-1)^{|\mathcal{I}|}\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{I})$ (see equation (5) of [1]).

Proof of Theorem 1 under Conjecture 2: Following [1], we expand (1) and have

$$\begin{aligned}
M_K(N;H)=&\sum_{k=1}^{K}\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\substack{1\le M_1,\ldots,M_k\\ \sum M_i=K}}\binom{K}{M_1\cdots M_k}\\
&\times\sum_{\substack{m_1,\ldots,m_k\\ 0\le m_i<M_i}}\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-1)^{M_i-1-m_i}\binom{M_i-1}{m_i}L_k(\mathbf{m}),
\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where

$$L_k(\mathbf{m}):=\sum_{\substack{d_1,\ldots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\Lambda_{m_i}(n+d_i)\tag{4}$$

and $\Lambda_m(n):=\Lambda(n)^m\Lambda_0(n)$. To estimate $L_k(\mathbf{m})$, one needs to distinguish between those i for which $m_i=0$ and those for which $m_i>0$. Following [1], we set $\mathcal{K}=\{1,...,k\}$ and introduce

$$\mathcal{H}=\{i\in\mathcal{K}:m_i\ge 1\},\ \mathcal{I}=\{i\in\mathcal{K}:m_i=0\},\ \mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{n\le x}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\Lambda_0(n+d_i)\prod_{i\in\mathcal{H}}\Lambda(n+d_i)\\ =&\sum_{n\le x}\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\Lambda_0(n+d_i)=\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\sum_{n\le x}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{J}}\Lambda_0(n+d_i)\\ =&\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\Big[\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})x+O(\sum_{\mathcal{J}'\subset\mathcal{J}}|E_{|\mathcal{J}'|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}'})|)\Big]\\ =&x\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})+O_k\Big(\sum_{\mathcal{K}'\subset\mathcal{K}}|E_{|\mathcal{K}'|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}'})|\Big)\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 1. We write the above as $f(x)=cx+E_{x,\mathcal{K}}$. In general,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{1^-}^{X}g(x)df(x)\\ =&g(X)f(X)-\int_{1^-}^{X}f(x)g'(x)dx\\ =&g(X)[cX+E_{X,\mathcal{K}}]-\int_{1^-}^{X}(cx+E_{x,\mathcal{K}})g'(x)dx\\ =&c\int_{1^-}^{X}g(x)dx+O\Big(E_{X,\mathcal{K}}|g(X)|+\int_{1^-}^{X}E_{x,\mathcal{K}}|g'(x)|dx\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{n=1}^{N}\Big(\prod_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\Lambda_0(n+d_i)\Big)\Big(\prod_{i\in\mathcal{H}}\Lambda(n+d_i)(\log(n+d_i))^{m_i-1}(\log(n+d_i)-1)\Big)\\ &=\int_{1^-}^{N}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{H}}(\log(x+d_i))^{m_i-1}(\log(x+d_i)-1)df(x)\\ &=c\int_{1}^{N}\prod_{i\in\mathcal{H}}(\log{(x+d_i)})^{m_i-1}(\log{(x+d_i)}-1)dx+O\Big(E_{N,\mathcal{K}}\log^K N\\ &\quad+\int_{1^-}^{N}E_{x,\mathcal{K}}\frac{\log^K(x+H)}{x}dx\Big).\end{aligned}$$

This is the analogue of equation (65) in [1]. Now, note that

$$\Lambda_m(n)=\Lambda(n)(\log n)^{m-1}(\log n-1)$$

when n is prime. We have, by following the argument in [1],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=1}^{N}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\Lambda_{m_i}(n+d_i)\\
=&\Big(\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})\Big)(I_{\mathbf{m}}(N)+O(H(\log N)^{K-k}))+O(N^{1/2+\epsilon})\\
&+O\Big(E_{N,\mathcal{K}}\log^K N+\int_{1^-}^{N}E_{x,\mathcal{K}}\frac{\log^K(x+H)}{x}dx\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where

$$I_{\mathbf{m}}(N):=\int_1^N\prod_{i\in\mathcal{H}}\big((\log x)^{m_i-1}(\log x-1)\big)dx.$$

Putting (5) into (4),

$$\begin{aligned}
L_k(\mathbf{m})=&I_{\mathbf{m}}(N)\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{J}\\ \mathcal{I}\subset\mathcal{J}\subset\mathcal{K}}}\ \sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}\mathfrak{S}_0(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{J}})+O(H^kN^{1/2+\epsilon})\\
&+O\Big(\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}E_{N,\mathcal{K}}\log^K N+\int_{1^-}^{N}\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}E_{x,\mathcal{K}}\frac{\log^K x}{x}dx\Big).
\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

Now, we use Conjecture 2. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}|E_k(x,\mathcal{D})|\ll_k x^{1/2+\epsilon}H^k.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}E_{x,\mathcal{K}}=&\sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_k\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}\ \sum_{\mathcal{K}'\subset\mathcal{K}}|E_{|\mathcal{K}'|}(x;\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}'})|\\
&\ll_k\sum_{j=0}^{k}\ \sum_{\substack{d_1,\dots,d_j\\ 1\le d_i\le H\\ d_i\text{ distinct}}}|E_j(x;\mathcal{D})|\ll_k x^{1/2+\epsilon}H^k
\end{aligned}$$

Applying this to (6), the second error term is $\ll N^{1/2+\epsilon}H^k$ while the third error term is

$$= \int_{H}^{N} \sum_{\substack{d_1,\ldots,d_k \\ 1 \le d_i \le H \\ d_i \text{ distinct}}} E_{x,\mathcal{K}} \frac{\log^K (x+H)}{x} dx + \int_{1^-}^{H} \sum_{\substack{d_1,\ldots,d_k \\ 1 \le d_i \le H \\ d_i \text{ distinct}}} E_{x,\mathcal{K}} \frac{\log^K (x+H)}{x} dx$$

$$\ll_k N^{1/2+\epsilon} H^k + \int_{1}^{H} H^{k+1} \frac{\log^K (x+H)}{x} dx \ll_K N^{1/2+\epsilon} H^k$$

as $H \le N^{1/2}$. Hence, (6) has an error $O(H^k N^{1/2+\epsilon})$ and the rest of the proof in [1] follows. Therefore, we have Theorem 1 under Conjecture 2.

References

[1] H.L. Montgomery and K. Soundararajan, *Primes in Short Intervals*, Commun. Math. Phys. **252** (2004), 589-617.

Tsz Ho Chan
American Institute of Mathematics
360 Portage Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306
U.S.A.
thchan@aimath.org